

McNAMARA, DODGE, NEY, BEATTY, SLATTERY, PFALZER, BORGES & BROTHERS LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
P.O. BOX 5288, WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596  
TELEPHONE: (925) 939-5330

JAMES V. FITZGERALD, III (State Bar No. 55632)  
NOAH G. BLECHMAN (State Bar No. 197167)  
McNAMARA, DODGE, NEY, BEATTY, SLATTERY,  
PFALZER, BORGES & BROTHERS LLP  
1211 Newell Avenue  
Post Office Box 5288  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Telephone: (925) 939-5330  
Facsimile: (925) 939-0203

Attorneys for Defendants  
CITY OF EL CERRITO, SCOTT KIRKLAND and DONOVAN  
BROSAS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MORAJ ERANDA WEERASINGHE,

Case No. C07-05916 MEJ

Plaintiff,

**ANSWER TO COMPLAINT**

vs.

CITY OF EL CERRITO, a municipal  
corporation; SCOTT KIRKLAND, in his  
capacity as Chief of Police for CITY OF  
EL CERRITO; DONOVAN BROSAS,  
individually, and in his capacity as an El  
Cerrito police officer; and, DOES 1-25,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

This answer is being submitted by named Defendant DONOVAN BROSAS, individually,  
and in his capacity as an El Cerrito police officer. Except as indicated otherwise, Defendant  
DONOVAN BROSAS, along with the previously answering parties, the CITY OF EL CERRITO  
and SCOTT KIRKLAND, will be referred hereto as answering Defendants in light of their unity  
of interests in the defense of this matter.

**JURISDICTION**

1. These answering Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in paragraph 1  
as they are legal matters not proper for admission or denial.

///

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

**PARTIES**

2. In answering paragraphs 2 through 9, these answering Defendants respond as follows.

3. These answering Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in paragraph 2 relating to the Plaintiff.

4. These answering Defendants admit that the City of El Cerrito is a municipal corporation organized under the laws of the State of California. These answering Defendants also admit that Defendant SCOTT KIRKLAND, at all relevant times, is the Chief of Police for the City of El Cerrito, per the allegations in paragraph 3.

5. These answering Defendants admit that named Defendant DONOVAN BROSAS, is, and was at all relevant times, employed by the City of El Cerrito as a police officer and was acting under color of law in the course and scope of his employment by the City of El Cerrito at the time of the incident alleged in Plaintiff's complaint, per the allegations in paragraph 4. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 4.

6. These answering Defendants deny the allegations in paragraphs 5 through 8.

7. These answering Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in paragraph 9 as they are legal matters not proper for admission or denial.

**STATEMENT OF FACTS**

8. In answering paragraphs 10 through 15, these answering Defendants respond as follows. Defendants admit that on August 23, 2006, at approximately 2:00 a.m., Plaintiff was detained by Officer Brosas of the El Cerrito Police Department and other officers. Such detention was brief and was effected so Officer Brosas could investigate suspicious circumstances that appeared to Officer Brosas to be a possible automobile burglary in process. For officer safety and other reasons, Officer Brosas detained Plaintiff and the other involved subjects at gunpoint until other cover officers could arrive. At no time did Officer Brosas or any other officer have any physical contact with the Plaintiff. These answering Defendants deny the remaining allegations of paragraphs 10 through 15.

**DAMAGES**

9. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraphs 16 through 17.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

10. In answering paragraphs 18 through 19, Defendants re-allege their responses to paragraphs 1 through 17 of Plaintiffs complaint. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraphs 18 through 19.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

11. In answering paragraphs 20 through 27, Defendants re-allege their responses to paragraphs 1 through 17 of Plaintiffs complaint. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraphs 20 through 27.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

12. In answering paragraphs 28 through 30, Defendants re-allege their responses to paragraphs 1 through 17 of Plaintiffs complaint. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraphs 28 through 30.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13. In answering paragraphs 31 through 34, Defendants re-allege their responses to paragraphs 1 through 17 of Plaintiffs complaint. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraphs 31 through 34.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14. In answering paragraphs 35 through 37, Defendants re-allege their responses to paragraphs 1 through 17 of Plaintiffs complaint. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraphs 35 through 37.

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15. In answering paragraphs 38 through 41, Defendants re-allege their responses to paragraphs 1 through 17 of Plaintiffs complaint. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraphs 38 through 41.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16. In answering paragraphs 42 through 44, Defendants re-allege their responses to

1 paragraphs 1 through 17 of Plaintiffs complaint. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraphs  
2 42 through 44.

3 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 17. In answering paragraphs 45 through 52, Defendants re-allege their responses to  
5 paragraphs 1 through 17 of Plaintiffs complaint. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraphs  
6 45 through 52.

7 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 18. In answering paragraphs 53 through 55, Defendants re-allege their responses to  
9 paragraphs 1 through 17 of Plaintiffs complaint. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraphs  
10 53 through 55.

11 **JURY DEMAND**

12 19. These answering Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in paragraph  
13 56 as they are legal matters not proper for admission or denial.

14 20. These answering Defendants hereby demand a jury trial in this matter.

15 **PRAYER OF PLAINTIFF**

16 21. Defendants deny the allegations and/or prayer for relief of Plaintiff under the  
17 "Prayer" section of Plaintiff's complaint, pg. 14:6-20.

18 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

19 1. AS AND FOR A FIRST, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these  
20 answering defendants allege that said Complaint fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause  
21 of action against these answering Defendants.

22 2. AS AND FOR A SECOND, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these  
23 answering Defendants allege that Plaintiff has failed to state facts sufficient to support a prayer  
24 for punitive damages against these answering Defendants in Plaintiffs' Complaint herein.

25 3. AS AND FOR A THIRD, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these  
26 answering Defendants allege that at all times and places mentioned in the Complaint herein, the  
27 Plaintiff failed to mitigate the amount of his damages, if any. The damages claimed by Plaintiff  
28

1 could have been mitigated by due diligence on his part or by one acting under similar  
2 circumstances. The Plaintiff's failure to mitigate is a bar to his recovery under the Complaint.

3 4. AS AND FOR A FOURTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these  
4 answering Defendants allege that Plaintiff's own negligence in and about the matters alleged in  
5 his Complaint herein was the sole proximate cause of the happening of the incident, and of the  
6 injuries, loss and damages complained of, if any there were, and said negligence on the part of  
7 Plaintiff bars recovery to Plaintiff or, in the alternative, that said Plaintiff's negligence in and  
8 about the matters alleged in the Complaint herein proximately contributed to the happening of the  
9 accident and to the injuries, loss and damages complained of, if any there were, and said  
10 negligence on the part of Plaintiff requires that any damages awarded Plaintiff shall be  
11 diminished as required by the law of the State of California in proportion to the amount of fault  
12 attached to said Plaintiff.

13 5. AS AND FOR A FIFTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these  
14 answering Defendants allege that Plaintiff has failed to state a cause of action in that each of the  
15 causes of action as alleged herein is barred by provisions of Sections 312 through 362 of the  
16 California Code of Civil Procedure.

17 6. AS AND FOR A SIXTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these  
18 answering Defendants allege that Plaintiff had full knowledge of all the risks, dangers, and  
19 hazards, if any there were, and nevertheless voluntarily and with full appreciation of the amount  
20 of danger involved in his actions and the magnitude of the risk involved, assumed the risk of  
21 injuries and damages to themselves.

22 7. AS AND FOR A SEVENTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE,  
23 these answering Defendants allege that Plaintiff's unclean hands preclude any recovery by  
24 Plaintiff.

25 8. AS AND FOR A EIGHTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these  
26 answering defendants allege that the Plaintiff by virtue of his own conduct and omissions has  
27 enhanced and materially contributed to the damages, if any there may be, allegedly sustained by  
28 Plaintiff as a result of the acts or omissions complained of herein.

1           9. AS AND FOR A NINTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these  
2 answering Defendants allege that there is no statutory or other basis for the attorney's fees sought  
3 by Plaintiff.

4           10. AS AND FOR A TENTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these  
5 answering Defendants allege that the matters complained of by Plaintiff, if committed by  
6 Defendants, were consented to by Plaintiff.

7           11. AS AND FOR A ELEVENTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE,  
8 these answering Defendants allege that at all times herein mentioned, the acts complained of, if  
9 any there were, were privileged under applicable statutes and case law.

10           12. AS AND FOR A TWELFTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE,  
11 these answering Defendants allege that they are immune from liability herein and/or Plaintiff's  
12 claims are time barred pursuant to the provisions of California Government Code Sections 810  
13 through 996.6.

14           13. AS AND FOR A THIRTEENTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE,  
15 these answering Defendants allege that the alleged acts or omissions of the peace officers  
16 complained of in the Complaint herein were based upon the peace officer's reasonable belief that  
17 the Plaintiff had committed crimes in the officer's presence and the officer used reasonable force  
18 to detain Plaintiff, effect the arrest, prevent the escape and/or overcome the resistance of said  
19 Plaintiff; and Defendants are therefore immune by virtue of the provisions of Section 836.5(a)  
20 and 836.5(b) of the Penal Code.

21           14. AS AND FOR A FOURTEENTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE  
22 DEFENSE, these answering Defendants allege that at or about the time of the alleged event, the  
23 Defendants were presented with and had in their possession sufficient facts to constitute probable  
24 cause for the arrest of Plaintiff.

25           15. AS AND FOR A FIFTEENTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE,  
26 these answering Defendants allege that at all times herein mentioned, all actions taken by the  
27 Defendant officer(s) were reasonable under the circumstances and taken under a good faith belief  
28 that the actions were not unlawful and Defendant officer(s) are therefore immune under the "good

1 faith immunity" and/or qualified immunity doctrines with derivative immunity to entity related  
2 Defendants.

3 16. AS AND FOR A SIXTEENTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE,  
4 these answering Defendants allege that only such reasonable force as was necessary and lawful  
5 under the circumstances was used by the Defendants.

6 17. AS AND FOR A SEVENTEENTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE  
7 DEFENSE, these answering Defendants allege that Plaintiff was himself acting in a suspicious  
8 and potentially threatening manner towards the Defendant officer(s) and the Defendant officer(s)  
9 acted in self-defense and/or in the defense of others.

10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 WHEREFORE, Defendants prays the following relief:

- 12 1. That plaintiff take nothing by way of his Complaint herein;  
13 2. For costs of suit;  
14 3. For attorney's fees;  
15 4. For such further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

16  
17 Dated: January 11, 2007

18 McNAMARA, DODGE, NEY, BEATTY, SLATTERY,  
19 PFALZER, BORGES & BROTHERS LLP

20 By: 

21 James V. Fitzgerald, III  
22 Noah G. Blechman  
23 Attorneys for Defendants  
24 CITY OF EL CERRITO, SCOTT KIRKLAND and  
25 DONOVAN BROSAS  
26  
27  
28

McNAMARA, DODGE, NEY, BEATTY, SLATTERY, PFALZER, BORGES & BROTHERS LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
P.O. BOX 5288, WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596  
TELEPHONE: (925) 939-5330